

# **Exhibit B**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

**MISSOURI PRIMATE FOUNDATION, et al.,**

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim  
Defendants;

v.

**PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL  
TREATMENT OF ANIMALS, INC., et al.,**

Defendants and  
Counterclaim Plaintiffs.

**Case No. 4:16-cv-02163**

**OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO COUNTERCLAIM PLAINTIFFS' FIRST  
INTERROGATORIES TO COUNTERCLAIM DEFENDANT CONNIE BRAUN  
CASEY**

COMES NOW Counterclaim Defendant Connie Braun Casey, by and through the undersigned counsel, and in response to Counterclaim Plaintiffs People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. and Angela Scott (together, "Counterclaim Plaintiffs") first interrogatories directed to Counterclaim Defendant Connie Braun Casey states as follows:

**INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS**

1. "You" and "your" shall refer to Ms. Casey and Missouri Primate Foundation ("MPF") and any representatives, agents, volunteers, employees, and others acting on their behalf.
2. "MPF" refers to Missouri Primate Foundation and its representatives, including but not limited to Ms. Casey and James Michael Casey, as well as all other persons or entities acting or purporting to act at its direction or on its behalf. It refers to both the corporate entity and the fictitious name, whether or not registered with any government authority.

3. The word “Chimpanzees,” when capitalized, refers to each and every chimpanzee that was housed at MPF at any time during the Relevant Time Period.

4. The term “Relevant Time Period” refers to the period of time from January 1, 2012, through the present.

5. The words “and” and “or” shall be construed either conjunctively or disjunctively as necessary to make the requests inclusive rather than exclusive. The word “including” shall be construed to mean without limitation.

6. The use of the singular form of any word includes the plural and vice versa.

### **INTERROGATORIES**

**Interrogatory No. 1** Identify all current and former MPF employees and volunteers during the Relevant Time Period by name, job title, beginning and ending dates of employment, and general job duties and responsibilities. For former employees or volunteers, please also provide their last known address and contact information.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Defendant Connie Braun Casey (“Ms. Casey”) and the persons for whom the identities are requested, not relevant to any party’s claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 2** Identify each of the Chimpanzees, including by providing the sex, dates of birth and death (if applicable), and pedigree (i.e., information regarding the chimpanzee’s parents).

**RESPONSE:** Objection. Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party’s claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues. Subject to and without waiving the above objections, Ms. Casey states as follows: Kimmie, female, 63; Crystal, female, 15; Kerry, male, 14; Conner, male, 22; Candy, female, 25; Tammie, female, 37; Tonka, male, 27; Mikkayla, female, 10; Chloe, female, 9 ½;

Kirby, male, 26; Kaykay, female, 27; Daisy, female, 28; Coby, male, 33; Cooper, male, 15; Joey, male, 14; Tony, female died approximately 2 years ago; Kelly, female, died several years ago.

**Interrogatory No. 3** Identify the owner of each of the Chimpanzees held at MPF on November 2, 2016, as of that date.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues. Subject to and without waiving the above objections, Ms. Casey states as follows: Ms. Casey owned the following chimpanzees on November 2, 2016: Kimmie, Crystal, Kerry, Conner, Candy, Tammie, Tonka. On the same date, upon information and belief Counterclaim Defendant Vito Stramaeglia. On the same date, upon information and belief, Counterclaim Defendant Andrew Sawyer owned Joey.

**Interrogatory No. 4** Provide a complete and detailed description of the current social groupings of each of the chimpanzees named in Defendants' November 2, 2016, Notice of Intent, including where each chimpanzee is housed and the name of each other chimpanzee in the enclosure.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory is vague as to the definition of "social groupings."

**Interrogatory No. 5** State the date or age at which each of the Chimpanzees was separated from his or her mother.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 6** Provide a complete and detailed description of each transfer of a chimpanzee to or from you to or from a third party during the Relevant Time Period, including the name and age of the chimpanzee transferred, the date of the transfer, the sending or recipient party, and the dollar amount paid or received by you for such transfer, if any.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 7** Provide a complete and detailed description of the enclosures in which you house or housed chimpanzees during Relevant Time Period, including exact dimensions, whether the enclosure is fully indoors or both indoors and outdoors and the dimensions of any outdoor section, which chimpanzees are or were housed in each enclosure, and the dates in which they were so housed.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 8** If you contend that during the Relevant Time Period, the Chimpanzees' social groupings and/or social housing was sufficient to meet their needs, state all material facts upon which you base that contention with respect to each of the Chimpanzees whose social needs you contend were met.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory is a contention interrogatory and requires Ms. Casey to articulate theories of her case that have not been fully developed. Ms. Casey will supplement her response once discovery is completed.

**Interrogatory No. 9** Describe your understanding (if any) as to what constitutes appropriate social groupings and/or social housing to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 10** Identify all relevant sources and expert information you consulted or considered in order to determine what type of social groupings and/or social housing is sufficient

to meet the needs of the chimpanzees in captivity and state the date(s) you first learned of the information.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response. Further, this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 11** If you contend that during the Relevant Time Period, the size of the Chimpanzees' enclosures was sufficient to meet their needs, state all material facts upon which you base that contention with respect to each of the Chimpanzees whose enclosure size you contend met his or her needs.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory is a contention interrogatory and requires Ms. Casey to articulate theories of her case that have not been fully developed. Ms. Casey will supplement her response once discovery is completed.

**Interrogatory No. 12** Describe your understanding (if any) as to what constitutes an appropriate enclosure size to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 13** Identify all relevant sources and expert information you consulted or considered in order to determine what enclosure size is required to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity and state the date(s) you first learned of the information.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 14** If you contend that during the Relevant Time Period, the design of the enclosures in which the Chimpanzees were kept was sufficient to meet their needs, state all material facts upon which you base that contention with respect to each of the Chimpanzees whose enclosure design you contend met his or her needs.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory is a contention interrogatory and requires Ms. Casey to articulate theories of her case that have not been fully developed. Ms. Casey will supplement her response once discovery is completed.

**Interrogatory No. 15** Describe your understanding (if any) as to what an appropriate enclosure design must include in order to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 16** Identify all relevant sources and expert information you consulted or considered in order to determine what constitutes an appropriate enclosure design to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity and state the date(s) you first learned of the information.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 17** If you contend that during the Relevant Time Period, the Chimpanzees' enrichment program was sufficient to meet their needs, state all material facts upon which you base that contention with respect to each of the Chimpanzees whose enrichment needs you contend were met.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory is a contention interrogatory and requires Ms. Casey to articulate theories of her case that have not been fully developed. Ms. Casey will supplement her response once discovery is completed.

**Interrogatory No. 18** Describe your understanding (if any) as to what constitutes an adequate enrichment program to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response.

**Interrogatory No. 19** Identify all relevant sources and expert information you consulted or considered in order to determine what constitutes an adequate enrichment program to meet the needs of chimpanzees in captivity and state the date(s) you first learned of the information.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response. Further, this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case

considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 20** Provide a budget breakdown for your average monthly expenses of keeping a chimpanzee at MPF, including but not limited to, the cost of housing, feeding, veterinary care, etc.

**RESPONSE:** Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

**Interrogatory No. 21** Provide a description of the daily husbandry tasks performed by each MPF staff and the approximate amount of time necessary to complete each task, to care for, feed, and maintain the housing of the Chimpanzees, and any other task that is performed on a daily basis in maintaining the Chimpanzees.

**RESPONSE:** Objection, this Interrogatory calls for a narrative response. Furthermore, this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome, merely intended to embarrass and harass Ms. Casey, not relevant to any party's claim or defense, and is not proportional to the needs of the case considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' resources, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues.

Dated this 20th day of June, 2018.

Respectfully Submitted,

KLAR, IZSAK & STENGER, L.L.C.

By:

  
BRIAN D. KLAR, #36430

DANIEL T. BATTEN, #58810

Attorneys for Co-Defendant

1505 S. Big Bend Blvd.

St. Louis, Missouri 63117

Phone: 314-863-1117

Fax: 314-863-1118

Email: [bklar@lawsaintlouis.com](mailto:bklar@lawsaintlouis.com)

[dbatten@lawsaintlouis.com](mailto:dbatten@lawsaintlouis.com)



## VERIFICATION

I, Connie Casey, hereby verify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing answers are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on June 14, 2018.

Connie Casey

Name

individual

Title

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on **June 20, 2018**, the foregoing was service by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

POLSINELLI PC  
KELLY J. MUENSTERMAN (#66968)  
JAMES P. MARTIN (#50170)  
100 S. Fourth Street, Suite 1000  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314.889.8000  
Fax No: 314.231.1776  
[kmuensterman@polsinelli.com](mailto:kmuensterman@polsinelli.com)  
[jmartin@polsinelli.com](mailto:jmartin@polsinelli.com)

PETA FOUNDATION  
JARED S. GOODMAN  
(Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)  
2154 W. Sunset Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90032  
323.210.2266  
Fax No: 213.484.1648  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim  
Plaintiff*

Patrick J. Hanley, Esq.  
214 E. Fourth Street  
Covington, KY 41011  
*Attorney for Plaintiff/Counterclaim  
Defendant Vito Stramaglia*

Missouri Primate Foundation  
12338 State Road CC  
Festus, MO 63028

Geordie Duckler  
9397 SW Locust Street  
Tigard, OR 97223  
[geordied@animallawpractice.com](mailto:geordied@animallawpractice.com)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim  
Defendant Andrew Sawyer*

/s/ Daniel T. Batten

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D T Batten', is written over a horizontal line.